

A.—Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—

(a) It is a directive principle of the Constitution of India that the State shall endeavour to bring about Prohibition. The Prohibition Enquiry Committee set up by the Planning Commission has submitted its recommendations in the matter. These recommendations are also under the active consideration of the Government of Mysore, and a policy decision will be taken in due course.

(b) & (c) Vide answer to (a).

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ತಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಉತ್ತರಕ್ಕನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಇದನ್ನು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಲು ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಇನ್ನೂ ಲೇವಾರಿ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ನೀತಿಯೇನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಚನ್ನಯ್ಯ.—(ಎ) ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಿರುವ ಉತ್ತರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡ್ಡೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಪ್ಲಾನಿಂಗ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನವರ ಸಲಹೆಗಳು ಇನ್ನೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯಲ್ಲವೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಯಾವ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನೂ ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Question hour is over.

QUESTION FOR ANSWER ON THE DAY

(but not taken up).

Compensation to Atchkatdars of Guruvur, etc., Bagepalli Taluk.

Q.—435. Sri B. V. NARAYANA REDDY (Bagepalli-Gudibanda).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether any compensation has been paid to the *atchkatdars* of Guruvur, Cheruvur, Balareddipalli, Bagepalli Taluk, for the unauthorised digging up of pits in the *atchkat* lands ;

(b) if not, where it is pending ?

A.—Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—

(a) The payment of such compensation is not under consideration of Government. The question of acquiring the land is under consideration.

L.A.

(b) Does not arise in view of answer to (a).

ADJOURNMENT MOTION.

Re: Situation arising out of the Statement issued by Ministers on States Reorganisation Commission Report.

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the 11th instant Hon'ble Sri J. Mohamed Imam gave notice of a motion for adjournment which runs as follows :—

“That this House do stand adjourned to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence, namely, the situation arising out of the statement issued on October 10 1955, by three Cabinet Ministers, Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao, Sri T. Channiah and Sri Kadidal Manjappa, in respect of the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission in violation of the principles of joint responsibility and showing sharp differences of opinion in the Cabinet.”

As the subject was important and as I was anxious to reach a decision regarding its admissibility only after hearing Hon'ble Sri J. Mohamed Imam and such other Hon'ble members as were prepared to assist in clarifying the position, I took up this notice on the 14th. Sri J. Mohamed Imam has urged that the Speaker should admit the motion because the expression of opinion by three members of the Cabinet on the Report of the States Reorganisation Commission has violated the principles of joint responsibility and that therefore the stability of the Government is threatened, particularly in such crucial times as the present. He has stated that an expression of opinion even in advance of any decision by the Cabinet would violate the principle of joint responsibility. He has justified the motion by saying that the public are interested in the stability of the administration and therefore in the stability of the Cabinet, and if there is a split in the Cabinet then the public will suffer. Before discussing

(MR. SPEAKER.)

this question of admissibility in the light of the remarks offered by Hon'ble Sri J. Mohamed Imam I should like to set out very briefly the circumstances leading to this motion.

The Union Government, in pursuance of their expressed policy to reorganise the States on a more rational basis, set up the States Reorganisation Commission in December 1953. The Commission toured all the States in India, met leading representatives of the country and took evidence, oral and written. It is well known that when the Commission visited Mysore, several leaders of public opinion met the members of the Commission and gave expression to differing views. It was also known that the Commission had submitted its report to the Union Government in the beginning of this month and that the report would be published on the 10th instant. On the same day a statement appeared in the newspapers from the three Hon'ble Ministers of the State expressing their views on the report of the Commission and their reactions to the same. Immediately thereafter, Sri J. Mohamed Imam has tabled this motion.

It is in this background that the admissibility of his adjournment motion is to be examined. Hon'ble Sri K. Pattabhiraman who supported Sri J. Mohamed Imam stated that it was neither right or proper that the Assembly should continue to carry on its normal business in the House when stupendous and far reaching issues are agitating the minds of men in the country.

The Hon'ble Sri Kadidal Manjappa, Minister for Revenue, who is one of the persons who made the statement referred to in the adjournment motion, stated that on the question of Reorganisation of States there is difference of opinion in the Legislature and in the country, and that the Ministers were also holding different views. He added that the Legislature has not expressed its views on the report and further that there is and has always been homogeneity in the Cabinet and support to the Leader. The Hon'ble Chief Minister opposing the request for

admitting the motion stated that the Hon'ble Sri Kadidal Manjappa and Sri A. G. Ramachandra Rao had spoken several times in the past expressing their views on the Reorganisation of States identical with what was contained in the Statement in question. He also stated that these three ministers in their individual capacities had written letters to the Fazl Ali Commission, which news had also been publicised quite a long time ago. He therefore observed that there was no urgency. He further stated that when the Fact Finding Report was being discussed by the Assembly last year, the Government gave the freedom of opinion and freedom of vote to every member of the party and that it was very clear that no decisions have been taken either by the Cabinet or by the Government party. He stated that the freedom of opinion and vote having thus been given and Hon'ble Members having been permitted to express personal and differing views there was no question of any violation of any constitutional convention whatever. He also observed that there was complete homogeneity in the Cabinet. He referred to the differences of opinion which obtained throughout India cutting across parties, Cabinets, communities and territories. He observed that it would be too much to expect any one Cabinet in India to have unanimous opinion and he stated that the Cabinet having not taken any particular view, there was no violation of any principle of joint responsibility in the particular statement made by the three Ministers.

I have given careful consideration to these several arguments. It is clear from the discussions which took place on the 14th that the Cabinet has not discussed this issue. It is therefore clear that there are no such differences in the Cabinet as would affect its unity or homogeneity in the administration of the State. It is also clear that the administration of the State has not at all been affected by these differences of opinion on this particular issue among the Ministers.

No question of violation of joint or collective responsibility also arises.